

Serial No.: 10/549,258
Art Unit: 2618

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 2, 5, 12 and 15 to 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent No. 6084638 to Hare et al and WO 02/25847 to Zydonik. The Examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection. Claim 1 specifically recites:

“processing means for receiving satellite signals and processing said received signals to generate analog signals without demodulating the received signals.”

Nowhere does either cited reference show or suggest this structure. As the Examiner has indicated, nowhere does Hare et al show or suggest any satellite signals. Furthermore, nowhere does Hare et al show or suggest any processing means for receiving satellite signals and processing said received signals to generate analog signals without demodulating the received signals. Rather, Hare et al specifically receives and demodulates transmitted PC video and audio channels using transceiver 14, as described in column 6, lines 27 to 31.

Zydonik teaches a satellite receiver system in which each receiver module demodulates, decodes, decrypts and formats the signal, as indicated in the Abstract. It is therefore clear that even if the teachings of Zydonik were to be combined with the teachings of Hare et al, the apparatus as set forth in Claim 1 would not be obtained.

Claim 11 is similar to Claim 1 but is written in the form of a method. Nowhere do either Hare et al or Zydonik teach or suggest:

“processing said received signals to generate analog signals corresponding to said channel responsive to said request signal without demodulating said received signals”

as specifically set forth in Claim 11. It is therefore clear that, even if the teachings of Zydonik were to be combined with the teachings of Hare et al, the patentability of Claims 1 and 11 would not be affected.

The Examiner has additionally relied on US published application No. 2004/0085143 to Stoddard et al. Stoddard et al relate to a precision noise generator. A

Serial No.: 10/549,258
Art Unit: 2618

person skilled in the art would *not* introduce noise into an apparatus for receiving satellite signals, as recited in Claim 1, nor into a method of receiving satellite signals, as set forth in Claim 11. It is therefore clear that Stoddard et al is not relevant to the invention as set forth in Claims 1 and 11.

US Published Application No. 2004/0163124 to Basawapatna et al, relates to a communication system using satellite, off-the-air and cable sources. The cable and satellite sources are decoded and demodulated and then remodulated, as set forth on page 3, in paragraph 27. It is therefore clear that Basawapatna et al is no more relevant to the invention set forth in Claims 1 and 11 than Zydonik and Hare et al.

Claims 2 to 10 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claims 12 to 20 are dependent from Claim 11 and add further advantageous features. The applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 11.

In a conversation with the Examiner on March 21, 2007, the Examiner corrected the citation of Pience 2002/0073434.

The Applicants have reviewed the cited references to Jutzi, Pience, Rakib and Miller, which have not been relied upon, and believe that these references are no more relevant to the instant Application than the references which have been discussed above.

The Applicants submit that the instant Application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Michael Pugel et al

by Catherine A. Ferguson
Catherine A. Ferguson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 40,877.
(609) 734-6440

Dated: Oct 10, 2007

Thomson Licensing, LLC
2 Independence Way, Suite 200
P.O. Box 5312